Revision of Strength in IRCC

3342. SHRI JHUMUK LAL BHENDIA: Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) the post-wise sanctioned strength provided by IRCC to their SC/ST Association and Mittal Committee during 1994;

(b) when the sanctioned strength of the Corporation was revised and what was its necessity when the Corporation was under wind up proposal;

(c) whether revised strength was increased or decreased;

(d) if increased, the reasons therefor and on which date it was increased;

(e) the date of revision and from which date it was utilised; and

(f) how many vacancies/points were meant for SC/ST and how many without dereservation approval in advance given to general employees from back date?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (DR. DEBENDRA PRADHAN): (a) Total sanctioned strength as provided to Mittal Committee during 1994 was 279. Post-wise details thereof are enclosed as Statement (*See* below).

(b) During consideration of the Mittal Committee Report by the Board in its meeting held on 8.3.1996, it was brought out that while reporting data of sanctioned strength each etc. to Mittal Committee, certain posts against which incumbents were in position, were inadvertently left out. The Board, after deliberations, authorized CMD to review the position and include all such left over posts of sanctioned strength. The sanctioned strength was revised accordingly.

(c) The revised sanctioned strength was increased, to include all the left over posts;

(d) The sanctioned strength was revised w.e.f. 1.2.1991, as per directions of the Board.

(e) The sanctioned strength was revised w.e.f. 1.2.1991. These vacancies were utilized for effecting promotions between 1991—93 in IRCC,including three SC/ST employees promoted through review DPCs held in the year 1996.

(f) During 1991—93, 11 SC and 3 ST officers/officials (including 3 officers promoted through review DPCs in 1996) were promoted against the vacancies/ points meant for SC/ST. A relaxation of three months in eligibility period was also allowed in the case of promotion of one SC officer. Only 10 reserved points were utilized for promotion of general employees, as per rules, since no eligible SC/ST candidates were available at the time of DPC/promotion held between 1991—93 in IRCC and reserved points were carried forwards as per rules. While ratifying all the promotions made in IRCC between 1991—93, the Board of Directors in its meeting held on 18.12.97 also approved the dereservation of 10 reserved vacancies, as no SC/ST employees were eligible for promotion.

Statement

Revision of Strength in IRCC

S.No	Name of the Post	Sanctioned Strength	Remarks
	CIVIL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT		
1.	CMD	1	
2.	GGM (T)	1	
3.	GM/GM(Mkt)	2	
4.	AGM(Mkt)	1	
5.	CM/DGMC	3	
6.	SM(CIV)	11	
7.	MANAGER(CIV)	3	
8.	DM(CIV)	8	
9.	SO(CIV)	10	
10.	SUPVR. (CIV)	2	
11.	SO(D'MAN)	3	
12.	D'MAN	1	
		46	
	MECHANICAL DEPARTMENT		
1.	AGM(EQPT.)	1	
2.	SM(MECH.)	2	
3.	MGR(MECH.)	2	
4.	DY MGR(MECH.)	1	
5.	SO (MECH.)	4	
		10	

S.No	Name of the Post	Sanctioned Strength	Remarks
	FINANCE & ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT		
1.	GGM(C)	1	
2.	CM(F&A)/DGM(F&A)	3	
3.	SM(F&A)	1	
4.	SR. MGR(FIN)	3	
5.	MGR(P&A)	7	
6.	I.A.O.	1	
7.	DY. MGR(F&A)	8	
8.	SO(A/CS)	19	
9.	SR. ASSTT.(A/CS)	12	
		55	
	PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT		
1.	GM(PERS)	1	
2.	CM(PERS/DGM(PERS)	1	
3.	MGR(PERS)	4	
4.	DM(PERS)	5	
5.	SO(PERS)	8	
6.	SR. ASSTT.	21	
7.	ASSISTANT	17	
8.	JR. ASSTT.	8	
9.	JR. BANK LIAISON ASSTT.	1	
		66	
	ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT		
1.	C.S.	1	
2.	PS to CMD/PS	1	
3.	ASSTT. SECY.	1	
4.	SECTT. SUPDT.	1	
5.	APS	5	
6.	P. A.	11	
7.	JR. STENO (ENGLISH)	18	
8.	HINDI OFFICER (DM-RB)	1	
9.	HINDI TRANSLATOR/SENIOR ASSTT.	(RB) 1	
10.	JR. HINDI TRANSLATOR	2	
11.	JR. STENO (HINDI)	1	
12.	CLERK TYPIST (HINDI)	1	
13.	RECEPTIONIST	1	
14.	R.T.O	1	
15.	TELEX OPERATOR	3	

S.No.	Name of the Post	Sanctioned Strength	Remarks
16.	CARE TAKER	2	
17.	L. SUPDT.	1	
18.	WELFARE ASSTT.	2	
19.	LIAISON COORD. ASSTT.	1	
20.	GEST. OPERATOR	2	
21.	ELECT. CUM-PLUMBER	3	
22.	SENIOR DRIVER	2	
23.	DRIVER	4	
24.	PANTRY ATTENDANT	4	
25.	DESPATCH RIDER	2	
26.	RECORD KEEPER	2	
27.	PEON ATTENDENT	18	
28.	DAK SORTER	2	
29.	SAFAI WALA	4	
30.	CHOWKIDAR	4	
		102	
	TOTAL	279	

Poor response from private sector in Port Activities

3343. SHRI RAMDAS AGARWAL:
SHRI V.P. DURAISAMY:
SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU:

Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact the Government's ambitious plan to involve the private sector in port development of the country has proved to be a non-starter, as reported in the H.T dated 7th April, 2000 when India is already moving too slowly with its limited ports;

(b) if so, the main reasons for not coming forward by Private sector even though projects worth $ 7 billion were offered by Government on a "build-operate-transfer basis"; and

(c) the steps Government propose to take to make private investment in ports more attractive with perspective/prospective/strategic planning?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (DR. DEBENDRA PRADHAN): (a) to (c) No, Sir. In all 24 projects aggregating to 92.20 million tonnes of port capacity at an investment of